

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CIRCULAR BUILDING OF SPARTA.

I thought that the appearance of Mr. Meader's and my own report on the excavations of the Circular Building at Sparta would have made any further comment on Mr. Crosby's ingenious, though quite hypothetical, remarks unnecessary. But Mr. Crosby has since published a second note.

I have before expressed an opinion, which I hold still more strongly now, that, even "at this moment, with the excavations we have carried on, I consider the reconstructions of the ancient topography of Sparta premature." At all events, it is not usual or wise to insist upon topographical hypotheses in the face of the clear facts revealed by the spade.

There are thus a few facts which I must bring out more strongly in view of Mr. Crosby's second note (AM. JOURN. ARCH., April, 1894). Mr. Crosby says in his paper (p. 342): "*But why, it may be urged, should Dêmos have been erected on a huge stone circular platform nearly one hundred feet in diameter! I admit this cannot easily be explained, if, as Waldstein supposes, this platform was actually of that size and shape. From my own observation, however, I should rather regard the diameter as nearer fifty than one hundred feet, and I believe, moreover, that further excavation will reveal the fact that this was not a round platform, but a sort of semi-circular retaining wall, erected with the object of giving the huge image a secure and elevated position close to the Agora and overlooking it.*"

Of Mr. Crosby's observation of archæological data I have no evidence beyond the paper in question. But what is quite unprecedented is the fact that he should not have realized the bearing and understood the meaning of the report on the excavations which was before him. A reading of the report with ordinary care would have made it impossible for him to write his second note.

The diameter, instead of being nearer fifty than one hundred feet, is in reality 43.30 *metres* (nearer 150 than 100 feet). The platform was not *semi*-circular, but circular; for there is even now more than the semi-circle of wall extant, and this in spite of the insertion of the

Byzantine churches, the manifest destruction and reconstruction in later times, and the fact that on the north and northwest sides, where the land has reached the upper level, there was no need of layers of masonry.

I do not know of other instances of a gigantic circular structure to give "a huge image a secure and elevated position."

If Mr. Crosby had inquired into the nature of the statue upon which he bases so much, I could have informed him, in the first place, that the statue was not larger than double life-size. Moreover, from the marble technique, the statue cannot be assigned to an earlier date than the year 300 B. C., and may be much later; while even elementary training in the history of classical architecture teaches that the lower wall with the large *orthostati*, the whole without clamps or mortar, belonged to a very remote period of Greek architecture, and could never have been created for that statue.

The whole structure is of great importance and interest, and suggests many questions yet unsolved. But Mr. Crosby's strictures are without any ground. There can be no controversy with him on these points.

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.

I must remark that when I said that the so-called "Tomb of Leonidas" had the form of a *templum in antis*, I had good grounds for saying this. The name by which it goes in guide-books and among the peasants is no more the one "usually accepted" by serious archæologists than the term "the Lantern of Diogenes" is at Athens.

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE IN ROME.

There has been quite a general wish to see the establishment in Rome of an American School of Archæology and Philology. Professors of Latin at some of our Colleges have interested themselves in the plan, and the Council of the Archæological Institute at its meeting last May appointed a committee that should coöperate with an organized attempt to bring about the foundation of such a school.

In the meantime a trial has been made of another sort and on an independent basis, and an American School of Architecture was opened in Rome this autumn. Whether, through the coöperation of Latinists and archæologists, there may be a consolidation of the various interests, remains to be seen. It is to be hoped for. We print below a communication from Prof. W. R. Ware, of Columbia College, wherein the genesis and character of the new school are outlined:

"Early in the summer a movement was set on foot to establish in